

Docket No.: DE 020298

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended. The drawings have been amended. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Examiner objects to the drawings for not being in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d). (See 09/05/08 Office Action p. 2). Replacement sheets have been included in this response, which are now in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d). As such, Applicants submit that the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

III. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1 and 5-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,838,275 to Lee (hereinafter "Lee") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,110,108 to Shimura et al. (hereinafter "Shimura") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,311,569 to Brozovich et al. (hereinafter "Brozovich"). (See 09/05/08 Office Action, p. 3).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "said receiving station being further arranged to **automatically** enable an interrupt in the communication protocol with the first calling station upon a receipt of an interrupt request from the second calling station in order to establish a connection to the second calling station...the receiving station comprising a computer program (6, 8, 10, 12) arranged to control said informing means **and said interrupt.**" (emphasis added). In contrast, neither Lee, Shimura, nor Brozovich teach an automatic interruption. Lee states that, "The patient may request an emergency diagnostic session at any time. The patient notifies the SCO that he feels this is necessary, and begins the session as described above.

Docket No.: DE 020298

The Observer will put on "hold" all patients undergoing routine sessions in order to devote full attention to the emergency." (emphasis added). (See Lee col. 16, ll. 54-60). In Lee, any interrupt of communications with a current patient for an emergency patient is done by the Observer at the Surveillance and Control Office; the interruption is not done automatically. In contrast, claim 1 specifically recites, "said receiving station being further arranged to automatically enable an interrupt in the communication protocol." Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Lee.

Shimura states that, "**The person in charge of the care center** confirms this display into comparison with the urgency priority of the patient B now on talking to **give an instruction through the keyboard** 14 (FIG. 1) as to whether an interruption of the patient A is allowed (step 6.sub.-- 17). In a case where an interruption of the patient A is allowed, an interruption instruction is issued to a switching system (step 6.sub.-- 18) **so that the person in charge of the care center** starts the conversation with the patient A." (emphasis added). (See Shimura col. 13, ll. 9-17). As with Lee above, Shimura uses a person to initiate the interruption in the communication between patient A and patient B; Shimura does not automatically initiate the interruption in the communication. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Shimura. Applicants further submit that Brozovich does not teach any interruption in a communication protocol, either manually or automatically. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Brozovich. Because claims 5-9 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lee in view of Shimura and Brozovich in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,004,266 to Clawson (hereinafter "Clawson"). (See 09/05/08 Office Action, p. 4).

Applicants submit that Clawson does not cure the above-described deficiencies of Lee, Shimura, and Brozovich with respect to claim 1. Because claims 2-4 depend from, and therefore

Docket No.: DE 020298

include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lee in view of Shimura and Brozovich in further view of Clawson. (See 09/05/08 Office Action, p. 5).

Independent claim 10 recites, "said receiving station being further arranged to automatically enable an interrupt in the communication with a first calling station upon an receipt of a interrupt request from a second calling station...automatically interrupting the communication to the first calling station, establishing a telematic connection to the second calling station." Applicants submit that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Because claim 11 depends from, and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Docket No.: DE 020298

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 5, 2008

By: 

Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276